





## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Attorney Docket No. 2006 0833A

Setsuo TSUJII et al.

Confirmation No. 9676

Serial No. 10/584,622

Group Art Unit 1794

Filed June 26, 2006

**Examiner Dalila Toussaint** 

CREAMS, WHIPPED PRODUCTS THEREOF, DRY POWDERS THEREOF AND PROCESS FOR PRODUCING THE SAME Mail Stop: AF

OK TO ENTER: /K,H./ (03/09/2010)

## **RESPONSE AFTER FINAL REJECTION**

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE UNDER 37.CFR.116 EXPEDITED PROCEDURE 1700

Sir:

Responsive to the Office Action of August 31, 2009, the time for responding thereto being extended for two months in accordance with a Petition for Extension of Time submitted herewith, Applicants submit the following remarks in support of the patentability of the presently claimed invention over the disclosures of the references relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims. Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of these remarks.

Thus, the rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Blake et al. (US '211) in view of Bradford et al. (US '431) is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that the Blake et al. reference discloses an acidic whipping cream "made of soluble soybean". However, the portion of this reference quoted by the Examiner on pages 2-3 of the Office Action does not refer to soluble soybean, but rather, refers to whipping agents "derived as protein hydrolyzates from, for example, vegetable proteins." These protein hydrolyzates are different from "the acid-soluble soybean protein" employed in the presently claimed invention. Protein hydrolyzates can be defined as a mixture of amino acids or peptides prepared by splitting a protein with an enzyme, which is consistent with the description at